

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

CRIMINAL NO.
04-10119-MEL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

JAMES R. HART

INTERIM STATUS REPORT

December 6, 2004

DEIN, M.J.

An Interim Status Conference was held before this court on Monday, December 6, 2004 pursuant to the provisions of Local Rule 116.5(A). Based on that conference, this court enters the following report and orders, to wit:

1. The government has completed its production of documents, and the discovery disputes have been resolved. The defendant needs additional time to address some medical/psychological issues which may be relevant to the outcome of this case.
2. The defendant does request expert discovery in the event the government elects to introduce expert testimony. The government will provide expert discovery 45 days before trial. The defendant will provide reciprocal discovery 20 days before trial.
3. The date for filing dispositive motions shall be set at the next status conference.
4. In this court's view, this is not a case involving unusual or complex issues for which an early joint conference of the district judge and the magistrate judge with counsel of record would be useful.

5. In this court's view, this is not a case involving features which would warrant special attention or modification of the standard schedule, except as provided herein.
6. It is too early to determine whether a trial is likely in this matter. The government estimates that its case will take two weeks.
7. This court finds and concludes, pursuant to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8) and Section 6(b)(8) of the Plan for Prompt Disposition of Criminal Cases in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts (Statement of Time Limits Adopted by the Court and Procedures for Implementing Them, Effective July 1, 1980), that the interests of justice, i.e., review of the case, review of evidence, consideration of alternatives concerning how best to proceed with this matter, and preparation of motions, outweighs the best interests of the public and the defendant for a trial within seventy days of the return of an indictment.

Accordingly, it is hereby ordered that, pursuant to the provisions of 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8) and Section 6(b)(8) of the Plan for Prompt Disposition of Criminal Cases in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts (Statement of Time Limits Adopted by the Court and Procedures for Implementing Them, Effective July 1, 1980), the Clerk of this Court enter excludable time for the period of December 6, 2004 through January 31, 2005, that being the period between the Interim Status Conference and the next status conference.¹

8. Based upon the prior orders of the court dated April 26, 2004, June 8, 2004, July 22, 2004 September 14, 2004, October 26, 2004 and the order entered contemporaneously herewith, at the time of the Status Conference on January 31, 2005, there will be fifteen (15) days of non-excludable time under the Speedy Trial Act (May 24, 2004 - June 7, 2004)

¹ The parties are hereby advised that under the provisions of Rule 2(b) of the Rules for United States Magistrates in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, any party may move for reconsideration by a district judge of the determination(s) and order(s) set forth herein within ten (10) days after receipt of a copy of this order, unless a different time is prescribed by this court or the district judge. The party seeking reconsideration shall file with the Clerk of this Court, and serve upon all parties, a written notice of the motion which shall specifically designate the order or part thereof to be reconsidered and the basis for the objection thereto. The district judge, upon timely motion, shall reconsider the magistrate's order and set aside any portion thereof found to be clearly erroneous in fact or contrary to law. The parties are further advised that the United States Court of Appeals for this Circuit has indicated that failure to comply with this rule shall preclude further appellate review. See Keating v. Secretary of Health and Human Services, 848 F.2d 271 (1st Cir. March 31, 1988); United States v. Emiliano Valencia-Copete, 792 F.2d 4 (1st Cir. 1986); Park Motor Mart, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co., 616 F.2d 603 (1st Cir. 1980); United States v. Vega, 678 F.2d 376, 378-379 (1st Cir. 1982); Scott v. Schweiker, 702 F.2d 13, 14 (1st Cir. 1983); see also Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 106 S. Ct. 466 (1985).

